

No. 6053-SW-1-75/19436.—The Governor of Haryana is pleased to make the following amendment in the "Rules for the Homes for Widows and Destitute Women" published,—*vide* Haryana Government Notification No. 3825-SW-2-72/14447, dated the 29th August, 1972 and appeared in the Haryana Government Gazette, dated the 12th September, 1972, namely:—

1. These rules may be called the "Rules for the Homes for Widows and Destitute Women (Third Amendment), 1975."
2. In the "Rules for the Homes for Widows and Destitute Women, 1972" Rule 2, Clause (vi) shall be substituted as under:—
(vi) "War Widows of Defence Personnel belonging to Haryana State and their dependent children."

B. S. OJHA,
Commissioner and Secy.

WELFARE OF SCHEDULED CASTES AND BACKWARD CLASSES DEPARTMENT.

The 24th/25th September, 1975.

No. 6868-SW4-75/21105.—The Governor of Haryana is pleased to re-constitute the State Advisory Committee for safeguarding the interest of minorities for entry into Government Service as under :—

1. Ch. Bansi Lal, Chief Minister, Haryana .. Chairman

Official Members

1. Ch. Shyam Chand, Social Welfare Minister, Haryana.
2. Ch. Maru Singh, Education Minister, Haryana.
3. Chief Secretary to Government, Haryana.
4. Director, Public Instructions, Haryana.
5. Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana,
Social Welfare Department .. Member-Secretary

Non-Official Members

1. Shri Phool Chand, M.L.A., Rohat,
2. Shri Phool Singh Kataria, M.L.A., Sahlawas.
3. Shri Phool Chand, M.L.A., Mulana.
4. Shri Behari Lal Balmiki, M.L.A.
5. Shri Khurshedd Ahmed.
6. Sardar Piara Singh, M.L.A.,

2. The functions of the Committee will be to advise the Government on general policy matters and specific programmes for safeguarding the interests of the minority communities in respect of their entry into Government services. In respect of any matter intended to be raised in a meeting of the Committee, notice should be given to the Members-Secretary at least one month before the date of the said meeting.

3. The Committee shall meet quarterly under the Chairmanship of the Chief Minister or as may be decided by the Chairman, and in his absence the Minister-in-Charge of the Social Welfare Department, and in the absence of both them any other official Member. Five Members present shall form the quorum of the Committee.

4. The term of the Committee will be two years but Government may, by express order, reconstitute the Committee at any time.

5. The Headquarters of the Committee will be at Chandigarh.

6. The members will receive travelling allowance and daily halting allowance as under:—

(a) Legislators in their ex-officio capacity, under the Punjab Legislative Assembly (Allowances of Members) Act, 1942, and the rules made thereunder as applicable to the State of Haryana.

(b) Members of Parliament in respect of journeys performed by rail, as admissible to members of the Legislature appointed in their ex-officio capacity, less one first class fare for journeys by rail to and fro.

- (c) Non-officials other than M.L.As./M.P.s. at one 1st Class Railway fare plus incidental allowance and road mileage as well as daily allowance as admissible to a 1st grade Government employee drawing a pay of Rs 1,000. The other conditions laid down in the Punjab T.A. Rules for Government employees will also apply to journeys performed by non-officials members except where otherwise provided.

7. The Secretary, Haryana Vidhan Sabha, will be the Controlling Officer for the purpose of countersigning the T.A. and halting allowance bills of the M.L.As. on the committee. The Commissioner and Secretary, Social Welfare will be the Controlling Officer for the purpose of countersigning the T.A. Bills in respect of the other non-officials members.

8. The expenditure involved shall be debitable against the budget allotment under the Head "19—General Administration-C-Secretariat and Attached Offices-L-Civil Secretariat (Non-Plan).

9. This issues with the concurrence of the Finance Department conveyed,—vide their U.O. No. 3022-3FG-II-75.

B. S. OJHA, Commissioner and Secy.

LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT DEPARTMENT

CORRIGENDUM

The 19th September, 1975

No. 10168-5Lab-75/28158.—In Haryana Government, Labour Department, notification No. 11823-5-Labour-73/39473, dated the 7th December, 1973, published in *Haryana Government Gazette*, Part I, dated the 18th December, 1973, respectively,

- (a) for "46. Punjab University",
read "47. Punjab University Chandigarh", and
(b) for "47. Punjabi University",
read "48. Punjabi University, Patiala".

M. S. RATHEE, Dy. Secy.

The 23rd September, 1975

No. 10220-5Lab-75/28059.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 88 of the E.S.I. Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Governor of Haryana hereby exempts permanent, regular and temporary employees of the Government Woollen Industries, Development Centre, Panipat from the operation of the said Act for a further period of one year, i. e., from 27th March, 1975 to 26th March, 1976.

2. The above exemption is subject to the following conditions, namely:—

- (1) The aforesaid factory wherein the employees, are employed shall maintain a register showing the names and designations of the exempted employees;
- (2) Notwithstanding this exemption, the employees shall continue to receive such benefits under the said Act to which they might have become entitled to on the basis of the contributions paid prior to the date from which exemption granted by this notification operates;
- (3) The contributions for the exempted period, if already paid, shall not be refunded;
- (4) The employer of the said factory shall submit in respect of the period during which that factory was subject to the operation of the said Act (hereinafter referred to as the said period), such returns in such form and containing such particulars as were due from it in respect of the said period under the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950.
- (5) Any inspector appointed by the Corporation under sub-section (I) of section 45 of the said Act, or other official of the Corporation authorised in this behalf shall, for the purposes of—
 - (i) verifying the particulars contained in any return submitted under sub-section (I) of section 44 for the said period; or
 - (ii) ascertaining whether register and records were maintained as required by the Employees State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950 for the said period; or

- (iii) ascertaining whether the employees continue to be entitled to benefits provided by the employer in cash and kind being benefits in consideration of which exemption is being granted under this notification; or
- (iv) ascertaining whether any of the provisions of the Act had been complied with during the period when such provisions were in force in relation to the said factory be empowered to:—
 - (a) require the principal or immediate employer to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary; or
 - (b) enter any factory, establishment, office or other premises occupied by such principal or immediate employer at any reasonable time and require any person found in charge thereof to produce to such Inspector or other official and allow him to examine such documents, books and other documents relating to the employment to him such information as he may consider necessary; or
 - (c) examine the principal or immediate employer, his agent or servant, or any person found in such factory, establishment, office, or other premises, or any person whom the said Inspector or other official has reasonable cause to believe to have been an employee; or
 - (d) make copies of or take extracts from any register, account book or other document maintained in such factory, establishment, office or other premises.

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 22nd September, 1975

No. 10437-Lab-75/28893.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Jai Dinesh Steel Industries (P) Ltd., Bahadurgarh:—

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 67 of 1975
Between

SHRI NIRMAL DASS AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S JAI DINESH STEEL INDUSTRIES (P) LTD., BAHADURGARH

AWARD

By order No. ID/RK/239-75/39946-50, dated 10th July, 1975, of the Governor of Haryana, the following dispute between the management of M/s Jai Dinesh Steel Industries (P) Ltd., Bahadurgarh, and its workman Shri Nirmal Dass was referred for adjudication to this Court, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

"Whether the termination of services of Shri Nirmal Dass was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?"

Usual notices of the reference being sent to the parties, they put in their appearance.

Shri Rajinder Singh authorised representative for the workman and Shri D. C. Chadha authorised representative for the management were present before me on 3rd September, 1975. Shri Rajinder Singh made a statement withdrawing the demand notice served by the workman on the management relating to the dispute as referred to this court, as a result of an amicable settlement entered into between the parties.

I as such in view of the aforesaid statement of Shri Rajinder Singh hold that there is no dispute between the parties requiring adjudication. I accordingly return a no dispute award with no order as to costs.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

Dated, 4th September, 1975.

No. 2211, dated the 8th September, 1975

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 10364-4Lab-75/28895.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Societa Coffecca Chemicals Corporation, Bahadurgarh (Rohtak):—

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 80 of 1975

Between

THE WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S SOCIETA COFFECCA CHEMICALS
CORPORATION, BAHADURGARH (ROHTAK)

AWARD

By order No. ID/RK/305-A-75/22037, dated 10th April, 1975, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following disputes between the management of M/s Societa Coffecca Chemicals Corporation, Bahadurgarh (Rohtak), and its workmen to this Tribunal, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

- (1) Whether attendance cards should be issued to the workers of the factory? If so, with what details?
- (2) Whether the workers should be paid bonus for the years 1971-72 and 1972-73? If so, with what details?
- (3) Whether any dearness allowance should be given to the workers? If so, with what details?
- (4) Whether the workers should be granted annual increments? If so, with what details?

Notices of the reference being issued to the parties, they appeared before this Tribunal on 5th August, 1975, when the management was directed to file the written statement in respect of the statement of claim filed by the workmen on an earlier date of hearing fixed for 7th August, 1975. The case was thus adjourned to this date for filing of the written statement by the management,—vide my order dated 5th August, 1975.

Shri Rajinder Singh Dahyia, authorised representative of the workmen has today made a statement that he has been instructed by the workmen concerned to withdraw the demands made by them on the management and as such he proposes to withdraw the demands.

It would appear in view of the statement of Shri Rajinder Singh Dahyia that there is now no dispute between the parties required adjudication. I as such hold accordingly and return a no dispute award.

Dated 4th September, 1975.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 10418-4Lab-75/28897.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Power Loom Owners Association, C/o East India Cotton Company, Faridabad:—

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 7 of 1972

Between

SHRI HARI CHAND AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S POWER LOOM OWNERS
ASSOCIATION, C/O EAST INDIA COTTON COMPANY, FARIDABAD

AWARD

By order No. Id/FD/335-B-71/341, dated 5th January, 1972, of the Governor of Haryana, the following dispute between the management of M/s Power Loom Owners Association, C/o East India Cotton Company, Faridabad and its workman Shri Hari Chand was referred for adjudication to this court, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (i) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

"Whether the termination of services of Shri Hari Chand was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?"

Usual notices of the reference being sent to the parties, the management filed a written reply dated 25th October, 1972, in response to the demand notice of the workman dated 13th August, 1970, claiming his reinstatement in service as a result of quashing of the award of the Labour Court, dated 23rd March, 1966, by the High Court on acceptance of his Writ Petition.

The management pleaded that the workman had been dismissed on 13th May, 1965, as a result of a domestic enquiry held against him in respect of his misconduct and that the reference in question was invalid on the ground that it did not relate to an industrial dispute on account of the inapplicability of section 2-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, hereinafter referred to as the Act. They stated that Hari Chand workman was not a member of the union which raised a dispute on 13th June, 1965,—*vide* notice of that date and that the espousal thus made by Textile Mazdoor Sabha to his demand was invalid. It was further stated that demand notice dated 13th August, 1970, was not served on them and the dismissal of the workman made,—*vide* order dated 13th May, 1965, after due enquiry and an opportunity to the workman to take part therein was valid. The workman,—*vide* replication filed by him denied the pleas of the management and reiterated his demand for reinstatement.

The following issues were thus framed on pleas of the parties,—*vide* order dated 14th November, 1972, of Shri O. P. Sharma my learned predecessor the then Presiding Officer, Labour Court :—

1. Whether the present reference is not covered by section 2-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 ?
2. Whether the demand notice dated 13th August, 1970, leading to the present reference had been duly served on the management ? If not, with what effect ?
3. If issue No. 2 is proved whether the said demand notice was illegal ?
4. Whether the termination of services of Shri Hari Chand was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

Issue No. 1 was decided by Shri O. P. Sharma in favour of the workman,—*vide* detailed order dated 11th April, 1974, with the findings that the reference related to an industrial dispute and was covered by section 2-A of the Act. He ordered that notices of the case be sent to the parties again. None appeared for the management on 25th August, 1975, despite service of the notice sent to them by registered post in that connection with the result that *ex parte* proceedings were taken up against the management and the statement of the workman in *ex parte* evidence was recorded on 26th August, 1975, the next date of hearing.

The workman while tracing the history of the case deposed that he was served with a charge-sheet Ex. W.1 on 30th March, 1965, and thereafter with a charge-sheet Ex. W. 2 on 1st April, 1965, and that on an enquiry being held against him on the basis of the aforesaid charge-sheets he was dismissed from service,—*vide* order Ex. W.3, dated 19th April, 1965. He added that this dismissal order was withdrawn by the management,—*vide* letter Ex. W. 4 and that the later again proposed to hold a fresh enquiry on the charge-sheets Exs. W.1 and W.2 referred to above with the result that he made an application Ex. W. 5 for his reinstatement on the basis of the withdrawal of the dismissal order Ex. W.3.—*vide* letter Ex. W. 4. He finally gave out that no proper enquiry was held against him after the withdrawal of the dismissal order Ex. W.3,—*vide* letter Ex. W. 4 and that he was entitled to be reinstated.

I have given careful consideration to the statement of the workman and all other necessary documents relied on by him. I find the case of the workman, that the dismissal order Ex. W. 3 made as a result of an enquiry on charge-sheets Exs. W. 1 and W. 2 was withdrawn by the management,—*vide* letter Ex. W. 4 dated 30th April, 1965 with simultaneous service of the same charge-sheets on the workman again well substantiated. The workman is found to have made an application Ex. W. 5 to the management on 12th May, 1965, for reinstatement on the ground that the dismissal order Ex. W. 3 had been withdrawn and that he had been paid wages for the period from 1st April, 1965 to 30th April, 1965, and that in case he was not permitted to join duty by the management, the later shall have to pay his full wages for the intervening period.

The management is found to have recorded an order marked 'A' on the back of this application giving the workman only 1½ hours time to reply whether he intended to take part in the enquiry pending against him. The workman having probably declined to do so, the enquiry was concluded and the workman was ordered to be dismissed the same day with an intimation to him of the action taken by the management,—*vide* letter Ex. W. 6, dated 14th May, 1965.

The workman while coming in the witness-box proved all the aforesaid documents. I see no reason to disbelieve his testimony particularly when the proceedings are *ex parte* against the management and the later has neither cared to put-in their appearance for defending their case nor have brought on record the proceedings of the enquiry allegedly held against the workman, resulting in his dismissal on 12th May, 1965.

No good ground for dismissal of the workman could this be made out by the management. It is on the other hand clear, that the charge-sheets served on the workman in the beginning were found unsubstantiated with the withdrawal of the dismissal order Ex.W. 3, *vide* letter Ex.W. 4 and the workman was charge-sheeted over again on the same allegations. Such a procedure by no stretch of imagination could be said to be proper or legal.

I am, therefore, convinced that the order of dismissal of the workman was unjustified. I, therefore, decide issue No. 4 against the management.

The workman deposed that he served demand notice Ex. W. 8 on the management before the matter was taken up in the Conciliation Office. This statement remained un-rebutted on record and I, therefore, see no reason to disbelieve it. I accordingly relying on the same decide issue No. 2 in favour of the workman. Nothing has been brought on record to prove this demand notice as illegal. I as such decide issue No. 3 against the management.

I as a result of my findings on the aforesaid issues, hold that the dismissal of Shri Hari Chand by the management was unjustified and that the former is entitled to reinstatement with all his back wages with effect from 12th May, 1965, with continuity of service. I answer the reference accordingly. There shall be no order as to costs.

Dated 3rd September, 1975.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 2202, dated 4th September, 1975

Forwarded (four copies to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

(MOHAN LAL JAIN)

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 10365-4Lab-75/28899.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Rohtak-Delhi Transport Private Limited, Rohtak :—

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 84 of 1975

Between

SHRI AVTAR SINGH WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M'S ROHTAK-DELHI
TRANSPORT PRIVATE LIMITED, ROHTAK

AWARD

By order No. ID/RK/43-G-75/23148, dated 29th April, 1975, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Rohtak-Delhi Transport Private Limited, Rohtak, and its workman Shri Avtar Singh to this Tribunal in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of Sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the action of the management in employing a new driver without giving preference to Shri Avtar Singh retrenched driver is justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

Usual notices of the reference being sent to the parties for their appearance before me, they were present on 19th July, 1975, the date of hearing fixed in the case. The copy of the statement of claim filed by the workman on that date was supplied to the management with the directions to the later to file their written statement on 8th August, 1975. The management failed to file the written statement on that date and prayed for an adjournment. This prayer being strongly opposed by the authorised representative of the workman, I heard the parties

and granted an adjournment to the management for filling the written statement conditional on payment of Rs. 30/- as costs. I ordered the case to be put up before me on 1st September, 1975.

The case was accordingly put up before me on 1st September, 1975 even though the costs were paid by the management to the workman, yet the former was not ready with the written reply. The management prayed for yet another adjournment for filling the written statement. This request being opposed by the authorised representative of the workman, I heard the parties. No valid explanation had been given by the management for their failure to file the written statement despite two opportunities being given to them in this behalf. In absence of such an explanation I had no other alternative but to strike off the defence of the management. I accordingly struck off their defence vide,—my detailed order dated 1st September, 1975.

The workman in *ex parte* evidence made his own statement and corroborated his claim that his services as an Driver being retrenched on 6th September, 1970, a new Driver named Shri Murari Lal had been employed by the management for driving Vehicle No. 5865 in preference to him with effect from March, 1974.

I see no reason to disbelieve the statement of workman particularly when the proceedings against the management are *ex parte* and their defence had been struck off on account of their failure to file the written statement despite two opportunities being given to them. There is in fact no rebuttal of the statement of the workman, so much as, the management Shri Surjit Singh present before me on 1st September, 1975 did not care to offer himself for making his own statement in rebuttal.

I accordingly relying on the evidence of Shri Avtar Singh workman hold that his services as a Driver being retrenched with effect from 6th September, 1970, Shri Murari Lal Driver was employed by the management with effect from 1st March, 1974, in preference to him and without notice to him (Avtar Singh). I, in the result further hold that the action of the management in doing so was unjustified and the workman is entitled to be reinstated as a driver with effect from 1st March, 1974 on the wages permissible to him under the conditions of his services. I answer the reference accordingly.

Dated the 4th September, 1975

MOHAN LAL JAIN,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 1501, Dated the 4th September, 1975.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 4th September, 1975.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 10035-4Lab-75/29030.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Mobex Auto Ancillaries, Faridabad.

**BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD
Reference No. 88 of 1974**

between

**THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S MOBEX AUTO ANCILLARIES,
FARIDA BAD**

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/74/792/27040, dated 19th July, 1974 the Governor of Haryana, referred the following disputes between the management of M/s Mobex Auto Ancillaries, 15/2, Mathura Road, Faridabad and its workmen to this Tribunal, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

1. Whether the workmen are entitled to the payment of bonus ? If, so, with what details ?
2. Whether the workmen are entitled to the grant of Dearness Allowance ? If so, at what rate ?

Usual notices of the reference being sent to the parties, directing them to appear before me for pursuing their case, none appeared on behalf of the workmen on 20th August, 1974 despite due service of the notice. Notices were issued again as a matter of caution and none appeared for the workmen even on 29th April, 1975 despite due service of their representative. Notices were issued again to the President

Davis and White Workers Union, Faridabad, for their appearance before me today and it is noticeable that none has appeared even today despite service of this notice on one Shri Chatter Singh.

It would appear from the resume of the case as stated above, that the workmen are not interested in pursuing their demand made by them on the management in respect of the dispute as stated above. I under the circumstances have no alternative but to proceed against the workmen *ex parte*. I order accordingly.

The burden to prove the issues in dispute arising from the demand made by the workmen on the management, being squarely on the workmen, the same remains undischarged in view of the absence of the workmen or their representatives before me and their disinclination to pursue the demands. The result is that the issues in dispute are decided against the workmen.

I accordingly hold that the workmen are not entitled to the payment of bonus or to the grant of dearness allowance as claimed by them from the management.

Dated 25th August, 1975.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 10038-4Lab-75/29032.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Haryana Paper Mills, 51 Industrial Area, N.I.T., Faridabad:—

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 148 of 1974

between

SHRI PREM CHAND, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HARYANA
PAPER MILLS, 51, INDUSTRIAL AREA, N. I. T., FARIDABAD

AWARD

By order No. ID/PO/859-B74/34460; dated Nil, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Haryana Paper Mill, 51, Industrial Area, N. I. T. Faridabad and its workmen Shri Prem Chand to this Tribunal, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

((1) Whether the termination of services of Shri Prem Chand was justified and in order ?
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

Usual notices of the reference being sent to the parties, they appeared before me and made their statements in terms of the amicable settlement arrived at between them. Shri Lakshmi Narain stated in agreement with Shri R. C. Sharma authorised representative of the management that the workman Shri Prem Chand had been employed by the management and he had no instructions to proceed further in the case. Shri R. C. Sharma, authorised representative of the management stated that there was now no dispute between the parties requiring adjudication.

I, therefore, in view of the statement of the authorised representatives of the parties particularly that of the authorised representative of the workman hold that there is now no dispute between the parties requiring adjudication. I as such return a no dispute award

Dated 25th August, 1975.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 1415, dated 26th August, 1975.

Forwarded (four copies) to Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 26th August, 1975.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.